UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,272	11/05/2004	Shaun Hopkins	62694-022	5961
	7590	EXAMINER		
2049 CENTURY PARK EAST 38th Floor LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-3208			LEVY, NEIL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/501,272	HOPKINS, SHAUN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	NEIL LEVY	1615
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 C</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 10 ☐ This action is application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under £	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)	withdrawn from consideration.	olication.
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Setion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/501,272 Page 2

Art Unit: 1615

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1, 4 - 10, 14,17,18,21-23,26-28,32-35,38-43 provides for the use of formulations, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 1, 4 - 10, 14,17,18,21-23,26-28,32-35,38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claims 10, 38-43 are USE claims, & not statutory inventions & are not given further consideration.

Application/Control Number: 10/501,272 Page 3

Art Unit: 1615

Claims 1, 4 - 9, 14,17,18,21-23,26-28,32-35 are argued for as (p. 10, last paragraph of arguments of 10/27/02) formulations for use in repelling&/or killing- As such, it is unclear if these claims are to be considered as METHODS, rather than as formulations. If so, there are no method steps.

Examiner has considered these claims as formulations, with USE seen as future intended use of the compositions & thus continued rejections where appropriate –

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1,4-9,14,17 -18,21-23, 26-29, & 32-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over MARENICK et al in view of VROMAN

MARENICH, has the instant compositions, but for cetrimonium chloride. See claim 6: neem oil, tea tree, thyme, lavender with claim 8, nettle and humectants of propylene glycol (claim 3) with water, triethanolamine, methyl paraben and propyl paraben and glycol stearate [0028].

These components are combinable in one multi-use topical composition. Concentrations are indicated in Tables; water to 80%, triethanolamine at 0.05-5%, propyl and methyl paraben at 0.1-5%; Ceteryl alcohol 2.5-7.5%; glyceryl stearate at 0.1-5%; paraffin at 0.5-5%; lavender at 0.5-5%, as other oils. Thus, neem oil would be expected to be 0.5-5% also, as would tea tree, thyme and nettle.

For VROMAN, see Table 1: water, cetyl alcohol, 5-7% cetrimonium chloride, and tea tree oil, lavender oil, triethanolamine and parabens are all at about the instant %. Also useful is neem oil and nettle (page 4, top) cetearyl alcohol, propylene glycol (page 4, bottom).

Both references are in the field of skin care. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize skin care means, to use Marenick

Art Unit: 1615

modified as desired to increase range of use of a topical composition, in order to provide a stable, safe from bacterial contaminant composition with good aesthetic properties.

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

Art Unit: 1615

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Applicant's arguments of 10/27/08 are that these references fail to show use as head lice repellents or killers. Examiner has examined the claims as compositions, with claimed use considered as future intended use, & not of patentable weight in consideration of the composition. Neither is patentable weight given for the specific use of each element of the claims- these elements are the ingredients of the prior art, whether or not used for the same purpose of applicant- they references are combinable, because the artisan would see they are in the same line of work, & the ingredients readily added to improve the stability, longevity & safety of the compositions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/501,272 Page 6

Art Unit: 1615

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NEIL LEVY/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615